

## Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Journal of Experimental Agriculture International</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_JEAI_83569
Title of the Manuscript:	Use of various organics substrates and evolution of chemical parameters during composting of Panicum maximum jacq and Oriza stiva L. straw
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

### General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journaljeai.com/index.php/JEAI/editorial-policy> )

Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<p><b>TITLE</b> Correct the word STIVA, because it is incorrect</p> <p><b>RESULTS</b> <b>3.2. Evolution of carbon and major nutrient content</b> <b>Table 4.</b> To correct the space that separates the values of R2 because it is incorrect. It is marked in the manuscript</p> <p><b>REFERENCES</b> Correct the pages of the references marked with red-yellow in the manuscript</p>	<p>The correction was made. It is SATIVA</p> <p>The table was revised. Corrections were made to the references.</p>
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<p>Material and methods <b>2.3. Data collected and analyzed</b> 1. Are you referring to the 1st, 2nd and 3rd week that the batteries were turned, or to the repetitions of each treatment? 2. Were the samples dried and packaged at the end of the experiment or at each sampling stage? marked lines in the manuscript</p> <p><b>RESULTS</b> <b>3.1. Evolution of pH-water, Ca and Mg levels during composting</b> The difference of one pH unit in treatment T2 is significant, but not for treatment 1, which only changed from 8.25 to 8.14? and could be due to an experimental error.</p> <p><b>Table 3. Variation of pH, Ca and Mg during composting</b> Why is there no difference here and in R3 with 0.01 if there is?</p> <p><b>DISCUSSION</b> 1. I do not believe that the decrease of only 0.08 pH units is due to the production of acids, since these generally lower the pH to values close to 6. I believe that it could be due to a measurement error.. 2. They say it decreased not that there was an increase, so what does ammonia have to do with it?  3. Like which polymers? They must discuss better these results</p>	<p>The compost turnings (of which there were three) should not be confused with the repetitions for data collection. This rectification was made to the manuscript to clarify this point. The samples were dried in the shade. This correction was made to the manuscript.</p> <p>It is possible that this was due to experimental error. However, I verified the statistical analysis again, and the results came out to be the same as the first time.</p> <p>When reading from top to bottom, it seems clear that for treatment T1, the pH rose slightly from R1 to R3, but if one considers the compost pH at the outset, one sees that the pH has actually gone down. However, if one observes treatment T2, it becomes clear that this increase is greater, especially when one examines the pH of the chicken manure at the beginning of the study (Table 2).</p>
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<p><b>RESULTS</b> <b>3.1. Evolution of pH-water, Ca and Mg levels during composting</b> Why didn't they measure these parameters for each of the mixtures at the beginning of composting, in order to calculate the efficiency of each of the treatments?</p> <p><b>CONCLUSION</b> It is important to carry out toxicity bioassays to know which of the composts was better, given that sometimes the soil of the fields is irrigated with synthetic fertilizers.</p>	<p>It was possible to do so and it would have made it possible to better appreciate the situation. But we only had this reflex and deemed it appropriate to analyze only the ingredients used as mentioned in tables 1 and 2.</p>

Review Form 1.6

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	